(1) No. 89-1341

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 22 1990
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP. and GHR ENERGY CORP., *et al.*,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro Se
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512) 723-6925

10180
Lutz Appellate Printers, inc. • NJ (201) 257-6850 • (800) 3 APPEAL • NY (212) 840-4640 • MA (617) 542-1114
DC (202) 783-7288 • PA (215) 925-6500 • USA (800) 5 APPEAL

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit erred in dismissing the direct appeal of petitioner, and forcing petitioner to go before the anti-women-segregationist federal courts for the Southern District of Texas, where petitioner has been devoid of all her rights to a fair or impartial hearing.

II. Whether respondents have the right to influence and command the Texas courts, the United States District Courts for the Southern District of Texas, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit into denying to petitioner the right to a fair hearing within an impartial court.

III. Whether the nation should move to abolish the anti-women-segregationist courts where women are defrauded of their rights.

IV. Whether power corporations, as respondents, be permitted to continue controlling the courts of the nation.

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS

(1) The women of the United States of America who are defrauded of their rights by the courts;

(2) The women around the world who live in bondage as inferiors, without rights;

(3) The people of communist nations who rise up to establish governments of democratic doctrines of liberties, and freedoms equal for all, and which do not exist for women equally within the courts of the United States of America;

4) The students of Communist China, who adhere to a replica of the Lady of Liberty as a symbol to equal freedom rights — and which Lady of Liberty has not existed for petitioner in any of the state or federal courts that petitioner has approached in the United States of America.

CITATIONS

It is that petitioner brings before the Court a precedent case, with documented evidence, that exposes the oppression of rights upon women, by the state and federal courts — and thus, the existence of the anti-women-segregationist state and federal courts within the nation.

It is that the precedent Dred Scott Case of 1857, relates to petitioner's precedent case, in that both moved under oppression of rights by the state and federal courts — one because of race discrimination — and one because of sex discrimination.

ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE COURT

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, as *pro se,* would approach the Court in oral argument, if the Court so permits it, or if the Court should decide that oral argument be part of the brief.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questions Presented	i
Certificate of Interested Persons	ii
Citations	iii
Oral Argument Before the Court	iv
Table of Contents	v
Table of Authorities	v
Opinions Below	2
Statement of Jurisdiction	2
Hearing Involved	2
Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved	4
Statement of Facts	6
Reasons for Granting the Writ	9
Conclusion	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes Cited:

28 U.S.C. § 453	6

Contents

Page

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 2

28 U.S.C. § 1471(1)(c)(2)(B) 5

42 U.S.C. § 1983 5

United States Constitution Cited:

Fourteenth Amendment 4

Article VI(2) 5

APPENDIX

Appendix A — Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit 1a

Appendix B — Petitioner's Direct Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit 3a

Appendix C — Order Concealed by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division 7a

Appendix D — Concealed Document by Conspiracy 9a

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP., AND GHR ENERGY CORP. *et al.,*

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

Before The Honorable Court:

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez, as *pro se,* prays that a writ of certiorari be issued to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, entered on December 6, 1989, within Appeal No. 89-6077 (Appendix, *infra,* 1a).

It is that the appeal court has denied to petitioner, the right

to a direct appeal, when there exists for petitioner no other alternative to a fair hearing, but within the procedures of a direct appeal, as the lower federal courts have clearly indicated, by actions and documentation, that petitioner will never have a fair hearing before such lower courts.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, without considering the reasons for a direct appeal, declares (1) "In this bankruptcy case, Ramirez has filed a direct appeal to this Court from an order of the bankruptcy court"; (2) "The district court has not yet ruled on Ramirez' direct appeal to that Court"; (3) The Judicial Code provides this Court with jurisdiction to entertain appeals in bankruptcy cases only after the district court has entered its final order"; and (4) "Ramirez must pursue her appeal in the district courts." (2a).

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

Cases in courts of appeal reviewed by the Supreme Court within 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

HEARING INVOLVED

The hearings involved arise from petitioner as creditor-claimant versus respondents as debtors before the United States Bankruptcy Court, District of Massachusetts, with petitioner as creditor-claimant filing a claim with file date of May 23, 1983.

I. It is that the bankruptcy case of respondents as debtors, was transfered from the Massachusetts District to the United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, of Judge Manuel Leal, on or about January 1984.

II. It is that Bankruptcy Court Judge Manuel Leal ignored and refused to hear the motions and petitions, including change of venue, submitted by petitioner as creditor-claimant before the court, while the petitions, motions, and orders of respondents as debtors were processed by such court.

III. It is that the claim of petitioner as creditor-claimant upon respondents as debtors, arose from the conspiracy between respondents and the Texas Court of Judge Antonio Zardenetta of the 111th District Court for Webb County, Texas, within Cause No. 31,320 (1979-81), to defraud petitioner of her property by defrauding petitioner of all her rights before the Texas court.

IV. It is that respondents as debtors before the Bankruptcy Court, Houston Division, presented an Order to the Bankruptcy Court Judge Leal, which concealed crucial evidence, and such Order was signed with date of November 5, 1988 by Judge Leal, and concealed by the court and by respondents as debtors, from petitioner as creditor-claimant, so that petitioner as creditor-claimant would not move for an appeal, and thus petitioner was further defrauded of her rights within the courts of the nation (7a)

V. It is that eight months later from the signing of the concealed Order, petitioner became aware of such conspiracy by respondents and the Bankruptcy Court, and thus, petitioner moved for an appeal to the United States Court of Appeals Federal District, then to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, where it was forced to remain within such anti-women-segregationist courts, and the petitioner moved before the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit with a direct appeal, as petitioner was certain, by proof of facts, that there would not ever be any kind of a fair hearing within the United States District Courts for the Southern District of Texas (3a).

VI. It is that respondents as appellee within Appeal No.

89-6077, moved to command the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, to deny petitioner as appellant, the right to a direct appeal, and thus, the Fifth Circuit, as the state and federal courts before, bowed to the demands of respondents as appellee, and moved to dismiss the direct appeal of petitioner as appellant, thereby forcing petitioner to go before the court of the Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, which Chief Judge, along with other judges of such federal courts, had previously defrauded petitioner of all her rights before such federal courts, in defiant discrimination and segregation of rights (1a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

It is that along the years from 1979 to the present time, 1990, respondents, in conspiracies with state and federal courts and officials, have been instrumental in defrauding petitioner of her constitutional, civil and human rights, so as to defraud petitioner of her property.

It is that the state and federal anti-women-segregationist judges have openly defrauded petitioner of all her rights before the courts, and moved to cover up the injustices with the shield of "immunities".

United States Constitution, Amendment XIV:

> Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.

It is that Texas courts deprived petitioner of liberty and property without due process of law, and Texas and federal courts

deprived petitioner of the equal protection of the law, by denying to petitioner the equal rights to a fair and to an impartial hearing.

United States Constitution, Article VI(2):

> This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States . . . shall be the Supreme Law of the Land; . . . .

It is that state and federal judges, in conspiracies with respondents, moved to defraud petitioner of her constitutional guarantees and security rights (civil rights) protected by the laws of the land to be equal for all.

42 U.S.C. § 1983:

> . . . Deprivation of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution . . . .

It is that respondents, in conspiracy with state and federal courts have moved to defraud petitioner of her civil rights to a fair hearing by imposing petitioner with one-sided hearings, one-sided judgments, intimidations, threats, and terror procedures.

28 U.S.C. § 1471(1)(c)(2)(B):

> . . . Direct appeal to the court of appeals . . . .

It is that with respondents having control over the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, snd such federal courts as anti-women-segregationist courts — there could never be a fair hearing for petitioner in an appeal before a panel of judges of such prejudice and controlled courts — thus the only alternative for petitioner to a fair and to an impartial hearing was a direct appeal before the United States Court of Appeals, for the Fifth Circuit.

28 U.S.C. § 453:

> . . . Oath of justices and judges . . ., to administer justice in equal rights, faithfully and inpartially . . . .

It is that state and federal judges maliciously and with open defiance to the doctrines of the nation, moved to defraud petitioner of her rights before the courts, violating the oath to justice and to impartiality, by segregating petitioner of the very basics of human rights to a fair and to an impartial hearing.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

I. It is that the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit erred in dismissing the direct appeal of appellant in Appeal No. 89-6077, when denying to petitioner her right to equal protection of the law within an impartial hearing in a direct appeal (1a, 3a).

It is that petitioner was ready to prove, with evidence, to the appeals court, that there existed absolutely no hope of any kind of fair hearings for petitioner within the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, and thus, for the appeal court to force petitioner to go before the court of the Chief Judge for the Southern District of Texas was equivalent to defrauding petitioner of her equal rights to an appeal within an appeal court of fair and of impartial hearing.

II. It is a fact that anti-women-segregationist courts are firmly established within the United States of America, and petitioner has the factual evidence to prove that the major oppressors of rights upon women are the state and federal courts of the nation, no different then the state and federal race segregationist courts that conspired to defraud the Negroes of their rights, clear up

to the United States Supreme Court of Chief Justice Roger Taney of March 1857.

It is that the Texas courts, including the Texas Supreme Court and the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas have moved as anti-women-segregationist courts, when all such courts have openly and in defiance moved to defraud petitioner of her constitutional, civil, and human rights, using severe oppression of rights, intimidations, threats, stigmas, blackmail, and terror procedures that identify with nations of inhumanities and fear as Communist China.

It is that the apartheid courts of South Africa, on race discrimination, and the anti-women-segregationist courts of the United States ot Amcrica on sex discrimination, both move in the same procedures of a double standard of justice — one standard of justice for men, and one standard of justice for women — and documents and procedures by the anti-women-segregationist courts remain as factual evidence.

III. It is that power corporations, as respondents, have moved to control state and federal courts, and in conspiracies with judges and officials, have firmly established foreign doctrines of oppression of rights, one-sided judgments, dismissals on commands to the courts, force and aggression rulings, aggravated perjuries, terror and torture, and all the procedures of racketeering using the courts as accomplice.

It is that respondent has moved to control the Texas courts and officials, the United States Courts for the Southern District of Texas, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, into denying to petitioner all the guaranteed rights to a fair and to an impartial hearing — and the documents and procedures within state and federal courts stand as proofs of the existence of the anti-women-segregationist courts and of the existence of control courts.

It is that respondent has moved, along the years, to take the property of petitioner by force and aggression, within conspiracies of the Texas courts, and the cover-up by federal courts, while petitioner has been imposed with the most inhuman intimidations, total oppression of rights, inhuman terror, and threats of bodily harm, and such remains within documentation.

IV. It is that since May 1983, when petitioner, as creditor-claimant, submitted her claim upon debtors respondents, before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, ignored all motions and petitions of petitioner as creditor-claimant, thus the court openly moving on a one-sided hearing controlled court.

It is that with date of November 5, 1988, the Bankruptcy Court Judge Manuel Leal, siged the Order submitted to the court by respondents as debtors, which Order was concealed from petitioner as creditor-claimant for eight months, so that petitioner as creditor-claimant would be defrauded of her right to move for an appeal.

It is that the Order submitted by respondents as debtors, and accepted by the Bankruptcy Court, consist of a fraudulent-deceptive document devoid of crucial and relevant evidence that remained concealed from petitioner as creditor-claimint, with the conspiracy of the court (7a).

It is that petitioner as creditor-claimant, moved to file an appeal, eight months after the concealed Order was signed, when outaide info mation disclosed the existence of the Order, and other crucial documents concealed by respondents as debtors and the Bankruptcy Court, for almost two years (9a).

It is that as petitioner moved as an appellant before the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, with a direct appeal,

then respondents as debtors moved to defraud petitioner of her right to an impartial hearing within a direct appeal, and moved to command the appeal court to deny to petitioner as appellant, the right to a direct appeal, and dismissed the direct appeal with date of December 6, 1989, and thus forcing petitioner to move for an appeal before the anti-women-segregationist court of Chief Judge James DeAnda for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, which judge previously had inhumanly, with threats, defrauded petitioner of all her guaranteed rights, and documents remain as evidence.

It is that while respondents moved to defraud petitioner of her property, the conspirator courts moved to defraud petitioner of her rights to defend the aggression upon her property and her person.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The reasons for granting the writ are two major issues moving in confrontation and defiance to the democratic doctrines of the nation: (1) The anti-women-segregationist courts of the nation that defraud women of their liberties and freedoms before the courts, and thus move under a double standard of justice; and (2) The controlled courts by power corporations and perverted judges that overthrow the government of due process and equal protection of the law, and establish racketeering courts of oppression of rights, intimidations, frauds, fear, and extortion.

It is that the two major issues, remain as a disgrace and a mockery to the judicial system of the nation, and as a dishonor and deep humiliation to the nation of democratic doctrines.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner pleads with the Court for a total investigation of

the anti-women-segregationist courts of the nation with strong sanctions and reformations of such courts, and petitioner further pleads for a formal public ruling by the High Court in securing permanently the constitutional, civil, and human rights for women, *equally* before the courts and before the nation.

Petitioner further pleads to the Court, to bring to an end, the long delayed right to justice by awarding to petitioner the relief compensatory damages of the original claim before the Bankruptcy Court of May 1983, plus daily interest to the present time, with further punitive damages of sixty-eight million dollars ($68,000,000).

It is that the issue of women's equal rights to constitutional, civil, and human rights is long overdue, and the oppression of rights by the courts of the nation remain within great injustices — then petitioner, and the women of the nation waits for a decisive ruling of true justice.

Respectfully submitted,

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner Pro Se

APPENDIX A — OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

(Filed December 6, 1989)

No. 89-6077
USDC No. H-89-3391

IN THE MATTER OF:

GHR ENERGY CORP.,

Debtor

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Appellant,

versus

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP. AND GHR ENERGY CORP. ET AL.,

Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas

Before POLITZ, WILLIAMS, and JOLLY, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Appendix A

This Court must examine the basis of its jurisdiction on its own motion if necessary. Mosley v. Cozby, 813 F.2d 659, 660 (5th Cir. 1987). In this bankruptcy case, Ramirez has filed a direct appeal to this Court from an order of the bankruptcy court. The district court has not yet ruled on Ramirez' direct appeal to that court. The Judicial Code provides this Court with jurisdiction to entertain appeals in bankruptcy cases only after the district court has entered its final order. 28 U.S.C. § 158(a) and (d). Ramirez must pursue her appeal in the district court.

APPEAL DISMISSED.

APPENDIX B — PETITIONER'S DIRECT APPEAL TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FIFTH CIRCUIT
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

IN RE:
USBC, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION
BANKRUPTCY CASE
NO. 84-03474 H1-5
CLAIM NO. 630-57

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ

Creditor-Claimant

vs.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP., AND GHR ENERGY CORP., ET ALS.,

Debtors

CREDITOR-CLAIMANT DIRECT APPEAL TO COURT OF APPEALS

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Marie Graciela Ramirez, Creditor-Claimant, as Pro se, within the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division — approaches the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit — seeking permission to proceed before

the Court with a Direct Appeal — as per USC 28, Chapter 90, Jurisdiction And Procedure (C)(B), page 265, USC 28.

It is that Creditor-Claimant filed a notice of Appeal before the United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, with file date of August 25, 1989 — but such Notice Of Appeal has been ignored by such court — thus denying to Creditor-Claimant the equal right to an Appeal.

I. It is that the Bankruptcy Court has devoided Creditor-Claimant of her right to approach the Court of Appeals — and within conceal procedures has moved to force Creditor-Claimant to be processed by the Court of Chief Judge James DeAnda of the United States District Court, Southern District of Texas, Houston Division within forced Civil Action No. H-89-3391.

II. It is that in a previous civil action, Judge DeAnda viciously defrauded Creditor-Claimant of her rights to a fair hearing, and in conspiracy with a Texas Judge, moved to publicly stigmatize Creditor-Claimant as of mental illness — and further threatened to submit Creditor-Claimant to a psychiatric testing — so as to forever silence Creditor-Claimant's voice to a fair hearing before state and federal courts.

It is that Judge James DeAnda, and many of the Judges for the Federal Courts of the Southern District of Texas — are anti-women-segregationist judges— and documents and actions stand as proofs of such facts.

III. It is that Creditor-Claimant has been forced to wait for more then six years before the Bankruptcy Courts (1) where the presiding Judge Manuel Leal, has totally ignored all motions and petitions of Creditor-Claimant (2) where Judge Leal has refused

to hear the Motions for Change of Venue of Creditor-Claimant (3) and where Creditor-Claimant remains as a hostage before such court, devoid of her rights to a fair hearing.

IV. It is that with date of November 5, 1988, Judge Manuel Leal, signed an ORDER, presented by Debtors to the Court — which ORDER consisted of fraud by Debtors and deceit to the Court, when vital information was concealed from such ORDER submitted by Debtors.

V. It is that such ORDER signed by Bankruptcy Court Judge as of November 5, 1988, was concealed by Debtors and by the Court from Creditor-Claimant, so that Creditor-Claimant would not move for an Appeal.

It is that Creditor-Claimant, by other information, was able to know about the conceal ORDER of November 5, 1988 — at the end of July 1989.

VI. It is that Creditor-Claimant recognizing that there existed very grave violations of fraud, conspiracy, deceit and concealment, involving the federal court — thus, Creditor-Claimant moved with an Appeal before the United States Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit, — but such Court required that Creditor-Claimant move before the Federal Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, first.

It is that Creditor-Claimant, thus moved for a Notice of Appeal before the Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, with file date of August 25, 1989 — but such Court refused to process such Notice of Appeal.

THE APPEAL

Appendix B

Maria Graciela Ramirez, as Pro se, pleads with the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, to hear the Direct Appeal of Creditor-Claimant — as there is no hopes of ever having any kind of a fair hearing from the Federal Courts for the Southern District of Texas. (See attached documents).

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Maria Graciela Ramirez
Maria Graciela Ramirez, Pro se
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512/723-6925)

No. 89-6077
(Filed October 16, 1989)

APPENDIX C — CONCEALED ORDER BY THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

IN PROCEEDING FOR REORGANIZATION UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE

CASE NOS. 84-03474-H1-5
84-03475-H2-5
84-03476-H1-5
84-03477-H3-5
84-03478-H3-5
84-03479-H1-5
84-03480-H1-5
84-05539-H2-11

CONSOLIDATED IN CASE
No. 84-03474-H1-5

In Re:
TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORPORATION, f/k/a/ GHR ENERGY and GOOD HOPE REFINERIES, INC., TRANSAMERICAN PIPELINE CORPORATION f/k/a/ GHR PIPELINE CORPORATION and SOUTHERN PIPE LINE CORPORATION, SOUTHERN STATES, INC., SOUTHERN STATES EXPLORATION, INC., LAREDO EXPLORATION, INC., SOUTHERN PETROLEUM TRADING COMPANY, LTD., TRANSAMERICAN GAS TRANSMISSION CORPORATION, f/k/a/ GHR TRANSMISSION, CORPORATION and SOUTHERN GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY, and JRS REALTY, INC.

Debtors

Appendix C

THE GHR COMPANIES, INC., f/k/a/ GOOD HOPE INDUSTRIES, INC.

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Claimant

ORDER

On this day came on to be heard TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation's (Debtor herein) Objection to Claim No. 630-57. Debtor appeared by and through Counsel, Claimant herein, Maria Graciela Ramirez, although noticed and having filed a response to said notice, wholly failed to appear. The Court considered the objection and it is therefore:

ORDERED that Claim No. 630-57 is allowed as follows:

1. $496,164.30 as royalties due Claimant for hydrocarbon production prior to the filing of the Bankruptcy Petition herein (Pre-Petition).

2. $242,298.49 as royalties due claimant for hydrocarbon production subsequent to the filing of the Bankruptcy Petition herein (Post Petition).

All other claims made in claim No. 630-57 not expressly allowed above are disallowed.

Signed this 5 day of November, 1988.

s/ Manuel Leal
UNITED STATES
BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

FPP#3/COURTORDER
11/23/88

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP.
CALCULATION STATEMENT
10/19/87 THROUGH 10/24/88

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
1517 GARCIA ST.
LAREDO, TX 78040

OBLIGEE NO: TR1030
DIVISION: 57
MAINTENANCE: 630
CLASS: 6
UNSECURED CLAIMS

THE TRANSACTIONS BELOW REPRESENT ALL ACTIVITY FOR THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED CLAIM FROM OCTOBER 19, 1987 THROUGH OCTOBER 24, 1988, WHEN THE SUCCESSOR PAYING AGENT, CONNECTICUT BANK AND TRUST, BECAME THE PAYING AGENT. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE OBTAINED UPON REQUEST FROM THE SUCCESSOR PAYING AGENT.

		---ALLOWED CLAIMS---		-LIQUIDATED CLAIMS-		-UNLIQUIDATED	----ESCROW----	
DATE	DESCRIPTION	PRINCIPAL	INTEREST	PRINCIPAL	INTEREST	PRINCIPAL	PRINCIPAL	INTEREST
10/19/87	INITIAL SETUP					12,000,000.00		
	BALANCE AT 10/24/88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,000,000.00	0.00	0.00

No. 89-1341

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 23 1990
JOSEPH F. SAPNIOL, JR.
CLERK

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner

vs.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORPORATION and GHR ENERGY CORP., ET AL.,

Respondents.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

JULIA R. LOVORN
140 Cypress Station Drive
Suite 200
Houston, Texas 77090
(713) 444-1199
Attorney for Respondent

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner

vs.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
and GHR ENERGY CORP., ET AL.,

Respondents.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW, Respondent, TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation (herinafter referred to as "TransAmerican" or "Respondent"), by and through its undersigned counsel, and hereby files its Brief in Opposition to Petition for a Writ in Opposition to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and would further show:

1. Respondent is unsure of what relief Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez (hereinafter referred to as "Petitioner"), is requesting, but to the extent a response is necessary to protect the rights of the Respondent, Respondent opposes the granting of any damages, claims or other relief to the Petitioner.

2. The Respondent contends that the Supreme Court of the United States of America is not the Court with proper jurisdiction to hear this matter because:

A. Petitioner has successfuly pled and disposed of all claims and amounts owed by Respondent in the matter styled **In Re: TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation, et al.**, Case Numberr 84-03474-H1-5. In that action the United States Bankruptcy Court fully allowed Petitioner's bankruptcy claim number 630-57 in the amount of $738,000.00. A copy of the Order allowing said claim is attached hereto as Exhibit "1"; and

B. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §158 (a) and (d), the District Courts of the United States have jurisdiction to hear appeals from final judgments of bankruptcy judges and only after a ruling from the District Court may Petitioner appeal to a higher court. A copy of the Order dismissing Petitioner's appeal is attached hereto as Exhibit "2".

3. If Petitioner files additional pleadings which clarify the relief sought, Respondent retains the right to respond accordingly.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Respondent, TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation prays that all relief requested by Petitioner in her Petition for a Writ in Opposition to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit be denied.

Respectfully submitted,
TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORPORATION

By: 

JULIA R. LOVORN
140 Cypress Station Drive
Suite 200
Houston, Texas 77090
(713) 444-1199

EXHIBIT "1"

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

In Re:	§	IN PROCEEDING FOR
TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS	§	REORGANIZATION UNDER
CORPORATION, f/k/a/ GHR ENERGY	§	CHAPTER 11 OF THE
and GOOD HOPE REFINERIES, INC.,	§	BANKRUPTCY CODE
TRANSAMERICAN PIPELINE	§	
CORPORATION f/k/a/ GHR PIPELINE	§	CASE NOS. 84-03474-H1-5
CORPORATION and SOUTHERN PIPE	§	84-03475-H2-5
LINE CORPORATION, SOUTHERN	§	84-03476-H1-5
STATES, INC., SOUTHERN STATES	§	84-03477-H3-5
EXPLORATION, INC., LAREDO	§	84-03478-H3-5
EXPLORATION, INC., SOUTHERN	§	84-03479-H1-5
PETROLEUM TRADING COMPANY, LTD.,	§	84-03480-H1-5
TRANSAMERICAN GAS TRANSMISSION	§	84-05539-H2-11
CORPORATION, f/k/a/ GHR	§	
TRANSMISSION, CORPORATION and	§	CONSOLIDATED IN CASE
SOUTHERN GAS TRANSMISSION	§	NO. 84-03474-H1-5
COMPANY, and JRS REALTY, INC.	§	
Debtors	§	
	§	
THE GHR COMPANIES, INC., f/k/a/	§	
GOOD HOPE INDUSTRIES, INC.	§	
	§	
	§	
MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,	§	CLAIM NO. 630-57
Claimant	§	

ORDER

On this day came on to be heard TransAmerican Natural Gas Corporation's (Debtor herein) Objection to Claim No. 630-57. Debtor appeared by and through Counsel, Claimant herein, Maria Graciela Ramirez, although noticed and having filed a response to said notice, wholly failed to appear. The Court considered the Objection and it is therefore:

EXHIBIT "2"

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
ENTERED

APR 04 1989

Jesse E. Clark, Clerk
By Deputy

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ, Plaintiff,	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. H-88-2343
TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORPORATION AND GOOD HOPE, ENERGY CORP., ET AL., Defendants.	§	

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint and Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment. The Court, having considered Defendants' motion and the record on file, is of the opinion that the Motion to Dismiss should be granted. Plaintiff's motion is thereby rendered MOOT.

It is ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

SIGNED this 3rd day of April, 1989.

KENNETH M. HOYT
United States District Judge

RECEIVED

APR 5 1989

Transamerica Corporation
Legal Dept.

ORDERED that Claim No. 630-57 is allowed as follows:

1. $496,164.30 as royalties due Claimant for hydrocarbon production prior to the filing of the Bankruptcy Petition herein (Pre-Petition).

2. $242,298.49 as royalties due claimant for hydrocarbon production subsequent to the filing of the Bankruptcy Petition herein (Post Petition).

All other claims made in claim No. 630-57 not expressly allowed above are disallowed.

Signed this 5 day of November, 1988.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

FPP#3/COURTORDER
11/23/88

No. 89-1341

(3)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 6 1990
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP. and GHR ENERGY CORP., *et al.*,

Respondents.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro Se
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512) 723-6925

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

10180
Lutz Appellate Printers, Inc. • NJ (201) 257-6850 • (800) 3 APPEAL • NY (212) 840-4640 • MA (617) 542-1114 DC (202) 783-7288 • PA (215) 925-6500 • USA (800) 5 APPEAL

8 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the lower courts will be permitted to continue as anti-women-segregationist courts — and as controlled courts by the power corporations like Respondent.

IN ORAL ARGUMENT

It is that with the overwhelming preponderance of evidence within Petitioner's Brief, the Oral Argument before the Court would be a repetition — but Petitioner is ready to approach the Court in Oral Argument at the order of the Court.

No. 89-1341

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP. and GHR ENERGY CORP., *et al.*,

Respondents.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

Before The Honorable Court:

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez as *Pro Se,* approaches the Court with the Reply Brief, based on the preponderance of

evidence presented within Petitioner's initial Brief.

It is that Petitioner has encountered with two major barriers of injustices before the state and federal courts (1) the anti-woman-segregationist courts, and (2) the controlled courts by the power corporations, like Respondent, thus the rights of Petitioner are held in bondage by the lower courts as Petitioner approaches the High Court.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

Cases in courts of appeal reviewed by the Supreme Court within 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

STATEMENT OF FACTS

It is that Petitioner received one booklet of Respondent's Brief on March 31, 1990.

Respondent's Brief does not contain an answer to Petitioner's Brief — as Respondent's Brief contains the same command orders to the Court, that have been submitted by Respondent to the lower courts which order the courts to defraud Petitioner of her rights to a fair hearing and fair trial, and the lower courts have all moved on the orders of Respondent.

Within Respondent's Brief there appear the following statements —

Page 2(1), Respondent states that — "Respondent is unsure of what relief Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez (hereinafter referred to as 'Petitioner'), is requesting, but to the extent a response is necessary to protect the rights of Respondent, Respondent opposes the granting of any damages, claims or other relief to the Petitioner."

(a) Respondent as Debtor, Defendant, Plaintiff, Appellee, and now Respondent, has always used the same excuse of not understanding Petitioner's testimonies, and the lower courts have ruled in favor of Respondent.

It is that Petitioner is fluent in the national language of English, and the presentations of Petitioner before the courts are very clear and to the point, and if Respondent and the lower courts do not understand the national language of English, there are remedial English classes offered all over the nation.

Page 2(2), Respondent states that " — the Supreme Court of the United States of America is not the Court with proper jurisdiction to hear this matter — ."

(a) It is that Respondent has decided to advise the Court what is and what is not the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Page 2A, Respondent states that — "Petitioner has successfuly pled and disposed of all claims and amounts owed by Respondent — ".

(a) How "successfully" has Petitioner pled and "disposed of all claims and amounts owned by Respondent" when under the participation and orders of Respondent, the lower courts have virtually gagged Petitioner from presenting testimonies within a fair hearing, have been instrumental in taking Petitioner's property by force and aggression, have participated in terrorizing Petitioner and threatened with bodily harm, and such is documented.

(b) It is that the Bankruptcy Committee moved to allow Petitioner's claim relief, but Respondent moved in conspiracies with the Bankruptcy judge to defraud Petitioner of such Claim

Relief by conspiring to use an ORDER signed by the Bankruptcy Court judge and presented by Respondents, to defraud Petitioner of such Claim Relief. (*See* Petitioner's Brief, Appendix C, page 7a.)

Page 2(3), Respondent states that — "If Petitioner files additional pleadings which clarify the relief sought, Respondent retains the right to respond accordingly."

(a) It is that Petitioner has clarified the "relief sought" with manifested evidence, and is ready to present further binding evidence if necessary.

(b) It is that Respondent does not "retain the right to respond accordingly" to Petitioner's Reply Brief. Respondent has the right to "respond" to Petitioner's Brief, but refused to present an answer, by moving instead with a command order to the Court.

It is that the inferior presentation of Respondent's Brief before the Court, is an open insult to any court in the nation.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner Maria pleads to the Court to Rule upon the merits of the manifested evidence presented by Petitioner within Petitioner's Brief — and thus, to bring to an end the inhuman eleven years of "justice denied" by the state and federal courts controlled by Respondent, and bring to an end the severe injustices and sufferings imposed upon Petitioner by Respondent.

It is that not only is Petitioner entitled to the Relief Damages from Respondent — but, within the laws of equal rights of the nation, is entitled to the public restitution of the rights of Petitioner, so unjustly and inhumanly denied by state and federal courts, along the years.

It is that the preponderance of evidence presented by

Petitioner before the Court, and the evading of an answer by Respondent, so as to conceal the frauds and injustices committed upon Petitioner — gives rise to a ruling in favor of Petitioner.

It is that power corporations have long controlled the courts of the nation, so as to defraud their victims of their property, by having the conspirator courts defraud them of their rights.

Respectfully submitted,

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner Pro Se